On That Clean Bomb, P. 4

The Joker In That Bill to Get Around the Jencks Decision, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. V, NO. 28 JULY 15, 1957 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

More Meat, Milk, Butter—and *Blood?*

In its article signaling the purge of Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich, *Pravda* cited Lenin's famous attack on Kamenev and Zinoviev for betraying their fellow Bolsheviks a few days before the October Revolution by disclosing the preparations for the rising and their opposition to it. *Pravda* made the point that Lenin "broke with all" even such old and respected comrades when they "went against the majority of the party and the Central Committee." The parallel was intended to provide an august precedent for Krushchev's own attack on his Old Bolshevik comrades. *Pravda* did not add what Krushchev himself said of this incident in his famous secret speech at the 20th Congress. Krushchev pointed out that dealing with Zinoviev and Kamenev, Lenin—unlike Stalin—"did not pose the question of their arrest and certainly not their shooting." They were restored to responsible position and were honorably referred to in Lenin's testament. Will Krushchev in dealing with his opponents follow Stalin's example rather than Lenin's?

The De-Stalinizer Re-Stalinizes

In his speech at the 20th Congress, Krushchev quoted Lenin as saying "Only he will win and retain the power who believes in the people. . . ." There is little evidence of belief in the people furnished by the manner in which Krushchev has aired the struggle in the Presidium. The *Pravda* editorial and article were turgid and opaque; the Central Committee communique was too obviously one-sided to be trusted; the popular speeches since have sought to denigrate and defame rather than to debate. This is how Stalin operated, how he prepared the public for his great blood purges. Krushchev's opponents are already being called "enemies of the party," which is almost as bad as "enemies of the people." That concept, originated by Stalin, "actually eliminated the possibility of any kind of ideological fight or the making of one's views known on this or that issue, even those of a practical character." Again, the words quoted are Krushchev's. The accusation meant death, though, as Krushchev said, "in regard to those persons who in their time had opposed the party line, there were often no sufficiently serious reasons for their annihilation." Were Krushchev's words recalled to him in the Central Committee?

One of the charges Krushchev makes against his opponents is that they opposed policies which move toward a relaxation of international tension. It is implied that they were against the policies of peace and of more meat, milk, butter, housing and loosened restrictions at home. They were, to read the Central Committee communique, against all that is good and hopeful in the changes since Stalin's death. Why, then, were not the proceedings of the Central Committee made public?

Not Only Unanimous But Identical

"It is not for nothing that our party is called the voluntary militant union of like-minded Communists, who have identical ideological and political views and identically interpret the aims and tasks of the party. . . ."

—Pravda, On Party Unity, July 8.

What could have done more to relax international tension than to have Krushchev say to all the world: "Look, we have done with the secretive methods of Stalin. This is where I and my colleagues disagreed. This is my side. This is theirs. I won in the Central Committee and I want the people of Russia and the world to know why. I am also going to demonstrate that in the new Russia, unlike Stalin's, men can lose their political position without losing their heads." The whole world would have breathed more easily at such evidence of fundamental change. As it is, even those most for peace must feel disquietingly, "Can such people be trusted?"

Malenkov An Imperialist Agent, Too?

What makes the shakeup strange and the official explanation suspect is that Krushchev was opposed not only by old-fashioned "hards" like Molotov and Kaganovich but also by a "liberalizer" like Malenkov and even a protege of Krushchev's like Shepilov. The one common denominator which might have drawn men of such diverse views together in so risky an enterprise was the fear that Krushchev was becoming the same kind of one-man dictator as Stalin, and that if a stand were not made soon it would be too late. One might believe that Molotov and Kaganovich were against liberalization but who will believe this of Malenkov? The short period in which he was in power with Beria as his First Deputy Premier is the period in which the concentration camps were thrown open, the doctors' plot exposed, the secret police rebuked, amnesty granted and a reform of the criminal code promised—a promise Krushchev has failed to honor. Beria was executed under circumstances never fully explained and on charges obviously false. Will it be discovered that Malenkov, too, was an imperialist agent?

We believe Krushchev's opponents were condemned by a Central Committee he packed with his own henchmen as Stalin did before him. We see no reason to believe that Krushchev will democratize at home or in the satellite states, though he may sweeten his victory with some dramatic economic concessions. The man who accused Gomulka of being a Zionist tool might as easily have precipitated a blood bath in Poland as in Hungary. This is a second Stalin, not a liberalizer.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Morse and Five Other Liberals Try to Block A Jencks Case Phony

Will The Senate Be Panicked into Acting As Rubber Stamp for the FBI?

The most serious aspect of the legislation being rushed through Congress to circumvent the Jencks decision is its demonstration of the immense political power exerted by our secret police, the FBI. It is a grave observation that in Congress J. Edgar Hoover commands greater influence by far than even so widely respected a political figure as Chief Justice Warren. Though few members of Congress give evidence of having read the decision, a bill to circumvent it was reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee after a brisk one day hearing at which no witnesses were heard except the Attorney General and an assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Identical legislation written by the Department of Justice has been approved by a subcommittee of House Judiciary without any hearing at all. It is painful to note that the Justice Department measure in the Senate so easily and quickly obtained as sponsors such liberal Senators as O'Mahoney, Kefauver and Neely as well as Eastland. It is worth a good deal to the FBI that in the Senate this should be known as the O'Mahoney bill, thus lending it liberal connotations.

G-Men Built Up as National Heroes

The swift action in Congress, like the extraordinarily phony campaign in the press, reflects fear of the FBI and desire for its favor. Its cooperation is valuable to newspapermen; its hostility, covertly and secretly expressed on a scale far wider than anyone realizes, may be deadly. As for Congressmen, as Drew Pearson explained in a most courageous column in the *Washington Post* July 5, the FBI "has a complete rundown on every Congressman, his private life and his family. Furthermore, no Congressman, if defeated or desirous of another government job, can become a judge or hold government office without clearance from the FBI." Added to this fear is a public relations apparatus which has built up as heroes of a free society those who engage in a political surveillance which contradicts its very essence. Pearson revealed among other publicity phonys of the FBI that the truth about its highly advertised capture of the Nazi saboteurs during the war was that the saboteurs "telephoned the FBI and gave themselves up." Secret police practices are gaining a beachhead in American life from which our children and grand-children may suffer.

Against that background, high praise is due Senator Morse and five colleagues (Neuberger, Murray, Clark, Hennings and Langer) for blocking rubber stamp action in the Senate by introducing amendments to the so-called O'Mahoney bill which might bury it for this session. As that new liberal voice from Pennsylvania, former Mayor Joseph Clark of Philadelphia, said in supporting Morse, these six Senators see no reason to be "panicked into action . . . on a scare basis" by the Attorney General. The campaign for this bill has proceeded on two levels of dishonesty, one for the general public and the more ignorant members of Congress, the other for the more thoughtful and astute. The box above provides a sample of the two approaches.

While the Senate Judiciary Committee in an official report did not dare underwrite the widespread hysterical and mendacious nonsense which Senator Potter's speech typifies, it was itself dishonest in claiming that the bill it reported out "reaffirms the decision of the Supreme Court" that a defendant in a criminal trial is entitled to see the original reports of any witness produced by the government. The public has been led to believe that the only difference between the Jencks decision and the O'Mahoney bill is that the latter would provide that the reports would first be inspected by the Judge and such portions handed over to the defense as he deems relevant.

Same Day, Same Senator

"The Court's decision . . . threatens the whole structure and operation of the FBI . . . makes life 100 percent easier for traitors . . . turns government records into a free peep-show for alien powers."

—Sen. Potter (R. Mich.) in the Senate July 1, the silliest of all the silly speeches on the Jencks decision.

"It should be emphasized, in view of the wide misinterpretation and popular misunderstanding of the opinion in the Jencks case, that the committee does not believe, after studying the decision very carefully, that a defendant would be entitled under the decision in the Jencks case to rove at will through government files."

—Report No. 569 from the Senate Judiciary Committee that same day signed (among others) by Potter.

The Crucial Joker

This is false. Senator Morse's astute and vigilant eye has brought to light the crucial joker in the bill. The bill would provide for the production only of such earlier reports by the witness as were signed by him "or otherwise adopted or approved by him as correct." In practice, as Senator Morse pointed out, most prospective witnesses interviewed by the FBI "are not given the opportunity to see the summary of their interviews." The Supreme Court decision upheld a traditional rule which gave an accused the right to see *"oral or written reports."* The O'Mahoney bill would apply only to written reports signed or otherwise authenticated by the witness. There are few such in the FBI files, and as Senator Morse said the bill's procedures could be circumvented altogether "by the simple expedient of discontinuing written reports in the few cases in which informants have given their information in that form." Another important difference is that whereas the Supreme Court ruled that where the government chooses not to produce the original reports "the criminal action must be dismissed," the bill allows the Judge either to "strike from the record the testimony of the witness" whose earlier reports have been refused, or declare a mistrial. This may conflict with the Constitution's bar against double jeopardy as well as with the due process clause.

"I Do Not Intend to Allow FBI Files to Be Made A Sacred Cow"

"The Supreme Court held in the Jencks case that defendants in a criminal prosecution brought by the United States should have access to earlier statements and reports of government witnesses. And rightly so, because, let me stress, it would be a police state tactic if we ever imbedded in our system of justice in the United States any power in the Government to keep from a defendant information to which he is entitled in order to have a fair trial.

"I do not care whether the information is in the files of the FBI or in any other Government files. There is no place in America for a police state tactic which keeps locked up from free men and women charged with crime, information which, under due process, they are entitled to have if they are to have a fair trial. I do not intend to allow FBI files to be made a sacred cow in our system of government. . . . We are dealing in too much haste with a precious right in criminal jurisprudence. . . ."

—Morse (D. Ore.) in the Senate July 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Profile in Courage: Kennedy Brave on North Africa But Shies Away Closer Home

Concern for Colored Men's Rights Should Begin in Alabama, Not Algiers

As one who loves France and all it symbolizes in the world, we find its Algerian policy painful. The effort to keep the Arab in an inferior and humiliating status is poisoning the political life of the Republic. It has degraded the Socialist party of France. It has led to the suppression of civil liberties. (Our brave friend Claude Bourdet's weekly *France-Observateur*, has several times been seized by the police for exposing the barbarity with which the natives have been treated in Algeria.)

Yet we found Senator Kennedy's speech in the Senate July 2 somewhat lacking as a tocsin of freedom. To complain that the war in Algeria "has stripped the continental forces of NATO to the bone . . . diluted the effective strength of the Eisenhower Doctrine . . . endangered the continuation of some of our most strategic airbases" is hardly to speak the language of Patrick Henry; indeed it sounds more like Admiral Radford.

To say, as Senator Kennedy did, that our policies in North Africa "cannot be tied any longer to the French" and that to take the Arab Nationalist side "will pay dividends to us in the years ahead" is pretty plainly to say that we propose to ditch the French and play up to the Arabs because it better serves our own purposes.

Brave—At A Safe Distance

In the eyes of colored men, the Algerian struggle is only another chapter in the effort of white men to keep them as hewers of wood and drawers of water. The test of Senator Kennedy's idealism will seem to colored men a matter to be tested much closer home than Algeria. When Kennedy obtained the floor of the Senate on July 2, Senator Russell of Georgia had just finished a wild, sweeping and feverish attack on the civil rights bill but Senator Kennedy did not use the floor to answer Russell. Senator Kennedy is bold on issues safely distant in time and space. During the McCarthy era, the Senator from Massachusetts wrote a book about courage — the courage shown by other Senators on other occasions in history—but he himself did not practice what he described. When McCarthyism was the issue, his own profile was discreetly set in silence. It is characteristic that on the eve of a battle to enforce the rights of colored people in our South, Senator Kennedy should launch a crusade to help the colored people—in Algeria. He's a brave man away from home.

Just how cautious the Senator from Massachusetts can be was demonstrated when Senator Neuberger of Oregon interrupted to suggest that we "set an example to France" by granting self-government and Statehood this year to Alaska and Hawaii. The Southern Democrats are sensitive on the subject of Hawaii. It would be the first "colored" State in the Union. Senator Kennedy said he did not want to "equate the situation of Algeria with that of Alaska and Hawaii." He said the Alaskans and Hawaiians "want to make their ties more intimate, which is not the situation with regard to the Algerians." This is correct. The French don't want colored men in Algeria to become more independent and we don't want colored men in Hawaii to become "more intimate." The result is the same in both cases: denial of self-government. But if Kennedy wants the Democratic nomination in 1960, he cannot afford to be militantly for civil rights any nearer home than Algeria. Even Hawaii is too close.

When Senator Dirksen of Illinois suggested during the debate on Algeria that the issue of freedom was universal, "whether they be Algerians or Irish, whether they be Orangemen in Belfast, or, for that matter, whether they be Negroes in our own country who are seeking self-government," he evoked no response from Senator Kennedy. We are not wooing the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama, for bases.

Correcting A Canard

In England the revelation that the Home Office was tapping telephones has precipitated an uproar in Parliament and the press. We note with indignation that the London New Statesman and Nation in its June 29 issue reported, "The classic comment on wire-tapping was made by that deaf, but pugnacious American journalist, I. F. Stone. 'Things have got so bad in Washington,' he said, 'that even my hearing-aid is tapped'." We hastened to check this canard at the Department of Justice, and were informed that, whatever may be the practice of Scotland Yard, the FBI never taps hearing aids except on express authorization of the Attorney General in cases where there is reason to suspect espionage, sabotage, advocacy of overthrow by force and violence or habitual addiction to subversive conversation. Otherwise the American's hearing aid is as inviolate as the ear-trumpet in the Englishman's castle.

Let Freedom Ring— But First Count the Bases

"Now I should like to stress the importance of France . . . If there is any doubt about it, all anyone has to do is to go there and count the air bases we use and all the facilities we have . . . that merits consideration on our part, and a caution as to the delicacy of the problem which confronts France."

—Senator Dirksen, replying to Senator Kennedy's proposal that we support Algerian independence.

When A Russell Raves

Senator Russell's speech, the curtain-raiser on the filibuster now underway in the U. S. Senate, deserves a close reading. When so distinguished a conservative as Russell of Georgia can speak as he did, one can only conclude that the white South is in an irrational state of mind. "Nowhere in our history," he told the Senate, "has any minority group in this country . . . been subject to a campaign which compares to that being waged against the white people of the South today." He said "the concentration camps may as well be prepared now." He "unhesitatingly" asserted that part III of the civil rights bill was written to make it possible for Eisenhower to use the Army "to destroy the system of separation of the races . . . at the point of a bayonet" and that Eisenhower's purpose like that of Sumner and Stevens was "to put black heels on white necks." One might easily infer, from Russell's speech, that the one place in the world where black men oppressed white was below our Mason-Dixon line.

The Russell speech is not comedy, except of a bitter kind. He is no Senator Foghorn. If the most respectable elements of the South talk this way, what can one expect of the crackers, the rednecks and the poor white trash who gravitate to the Klan? Hill of Alabama, a progressive on everything but the sacred right to hold the Negro down, rose to say that he had never heard "a calmer, a more judicious, a more logically and cogently reasoned" address than Russell's—though the Senate has not heard such raving from a responsible Senator since the "bloody shirt" era.

From the North, only two Senators rose to reply, Douglas and Dirksen, both of Illinois. The former, the intellectual leader of the fight for civil rights, spoke with a conciliatory and principled statesmanship. Dirksen was less tactful. "Seldom in my long legislative experience," he said, "have I seen within the frame of a single speech so many ghosts discovered under the same bed."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Right to Travel Inches Forward in the Donald Ogden Stewart Case

Unfit to Print? The New York Times and Mansfield's "Clean" Bomb Speech

Clean Bomb Controversy: The *New York Times,* which often seems to be edited by Admiral Strauss whenever atomic news is involved, gave its readers no summary of Senator Mansfield's thoughtful speech July 3 on the question of a "clean" bomb. Mansfield pointed out (1) the recent Teller-Lawrence visit to the White House recalls their misleading and politically motivated joint statement on the eve of the 1956 presidential election that "the radioactivity produced by the testing program is insignificant" (2) their assurance a "clean" bomb could be developed was contradicted by AEC scientist Dr. Alvin C. Graves who testified at the recent fallout hearings "that complete cleanliness in hydrogen bombs was impossible" (3) even a bomb 96 percent clean "would still release more fallout than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima" and asked (4) "Are we willing to give our formula to the Soviet Union so that she can continue her tests without contaminating the atmosphere?" Mansfield struck at the implication that so huge an explosive force as the H-bomb even if "clean" could be used without killing "hundreds of thousands of innocent people" and suggested that in actual warfare the military could find good strategic reasons for using dirty bombs, since these would render huge areas inaccessible to the enemy without any need to occupy them.

Right to Travel: Inching forward. The Donald Ogden Stewart decision was a defeat for the State Department. Even Judge Prettyman, who dominates the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, said he doubted "the legal validity of a regulation which would peremptorily deny a passport to any person who ever at any time has had any Communist connections" and in a footnote cited the Supreme Court's recent decisions in the Schware and Konigsberg cases which held that past Communist membership could not be the basis of exclusion from the legal profession. The Department must now either give Stewart a passport or hold a hearing and rely on associational effluvia so long past that the courts on appeal may reverse. While the Stewart case deals with an affidavit which denied Communist party membership for the past 15 years, Corliss Lamont's suit will test the new passport forms which require a non-Communist oath as condition for a passport. The Department is heading for almost certain defeat in another case just argued before the Court of Appeals here, that of Wilbur Bruce Dayton, a physicist who filed an affidavit denying that he was *ever* a Communist or a member of any organization on the Attorney General's list. Denial of a passport to Dayton is based on grounds so vague that the Supreme Court might use it to set some outer limits at least on the State Department's powers.

In Our Own Backyard

"Ever since Colonel Castillo overthrew the Communist infiltrated regime of Col. Jacob Arbenz Guzman in June, 1954, and dissolved his supporting political parties, no opposition parties have functioned in Guatemala."

—Delayed cable reporting Guatemalan student protests June 28 in the New York Times, July 7.

Constructive Suggestion: As important as Senator Humphrey's warning that there could be no viable world disarmament agreement without Communist China was his suggestion (largely ignored by the press) that Korea—and later Vietnam—be made pilot tests of arms inspection proposals. Humphrey said that "the danger of an arms competition" between North and South Korea led him to propose that before the armistice breaks down completely the UN command should be authorized to negotiate "new military arrangements providing for a thinning out of armed forces and armaments on both sides of the armistice lines and for effective . . . mutual aerial and ground inspection of the type that both the United States and the Soviet Union have already accepted in principle." Korea could thus become a testing ground for peace.

Funniest Item of The Week: The warning by that distinguished civil libertarian, Senator James Eastland of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee, close follower of the Communist movement, that passage of the Civil Rights bill would reactivate a Reconstruction statute known as the Compulsory Informer Act, which (so he says) would penalize "anyone who neglects or refuses to reveal information relative to . . . any violation of the so-called civil rights of others."

For New York Readers: IFS on "Night Beat" TV This Coming Thursday Night

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

7/15/57

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3. 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED